

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

By this Amendment, claims 14 and 23 are amended, leaving claims 15-20, 22, 24-30 and 32 unchanged. Claims 1-13, 21, and 31 were canceled in an earlier Amendment.

On pages 2 and 3 of the March 30, 2006 Office action, claims 14, 15, 23, 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over German Patent No. DE 199 24 662 A1 in the name of Block (hereinafter “Block”). Also, on pages 2, 4, and 5 of the Office action, claims 14-17, 19, 20, 22-27, 29, 30, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Netherlands Patent No. 1017344 in the name of Laar et al. (hereinafter “Laar”). Finally, on pages 2, 5, and 6 of the Office action, claims 14, 16, 18, 23, 24, 26, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Korean Patent Publication No. 1020020072622 in the name of Park (hereinafter “Park”). Also, in a telephonic Examiner’s Interview with the undersigned Applicant’s Representative on July 25, 2006, claims 14 and 23 as filed in the March 17, 2006 Amendment Accompany Request for Continued Examination were discussed. In the Interview, the Examiner summarized his arguments set forth in greater detail in the March 30, 2006 Office action. Also in the Interview, the amendments hereby made to claims 14 and 23 were proposed and discussed. The substance of the Applicant’s remarks in the Interview are presented below. No agreement was reached regarding amended claims 14 and 23.

Claim 14 is hereby amended, and calls for:

Articulated wiper arm of a wiper apparatus for windows of motor vehicles, having a free end and a non-free end opposite the free end, the free end of the articulated wiper arm having a device for detachably and pivotably connecting to a wiper blade, in particular for connecting to a non-articulated wiper blade, the device for connecting to the wiper blade being fixed to the wiper arm and comprising

an articulating bolt for pivotably carrying the wiper blade, and  
a safety hook for partially gripping around the wiper blade in an operating position thereof,

wherein the safety hook is a bent section of a wall defining the free end of the wiper arm, and the articulating bolt is located between the safety hook and the non-free end of the articulated wiper arm; and

wherein the articulating bolt extends from the wall of the wiper arm.

Claim 23 is also hereby amended, and calls for:

A windshield wiper assembly comprising:

an articulated wiper arm having a free end and a non-free end opposite the free end;  
a wiper blade; and

a device for detachably and pivotably connecting the wiper arm and the wiper blade, the device being fixed to the wiper arm and including an articulating bolt pivotably carrying the wiper blade, and a safety hook partially gripping around the wiper blade in an operating position thereof, the safety hook being a bent section of a wall defining the free end of the wiper arm,

wherein the articulating bolt is located between the safety hook and the non-free end of the articulated wiper arm; and

wherein the articulating bolt extends from the wall of the wiper arm.

Neither Block, van de Laar, Park, nor their combination teach, describe, or suggest an articulated wiper arm or a windshield wiper assembly having a device for detachably and pivotably connecting a wiper blade, wherein the device comprises an articulating bolt extending from a wall defining a free end of the wiper arm, and wherein the articulating bolt is located between a non-free end of the wiper arm and a safety hook defined by a bent section of the same wall defining the free end of the wiper arm. In each reference, a pin extends from an end of the wiper arm, as does another protrusion (compared by the Examiner to the "safety hook" in claims 14 and 23) located between the pin and the non-free end of the wiper arm. Also, each of these other protrusions are defined by a wall that is different than the wall from which the pin extends. These are significant differences between the devices disclosed by Block, Laar, and Park, and the wiper arm and windshield wiper assembly claimed in amended claims 14 and 23, and represent features that can significantly impact the structure and efficient manufacture of the resulting wiper arm and windshield wiper assembly.

Furthermore, Block, Laar, and Park all fail to provide any suggestion regarding modification of their respective devices to be similar to the wiper arm or windshield wiper assembly claimed in amended claims 14 and 23, nor why such a modification would be desirable.

Accordingly, and for other reasons not discussed herein, the Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 14 and 23 are novel and patentable over Block, Laar, and Park. Withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of amended claims 14 and 23 is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 15-20 and 22, and claims 24-30 and 32 are each dependent upon amended claims 14 and 23, respectfully, and are allowable based upon amended claims 14 and 23 and upon other features and elements claimed in claims 15-20, 22, 24-30, and 32 but not discussed herein.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentably distinct over the prior art, that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Entry of this Amendment is therefore requested. If any issues remain outstanding upon entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Applicant's Representative at (414) 225-8266.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher B. Austin  
Reg. No. 41,592

Docket No.: 081276-1019

Michael Best & Friedrich LLP  
100 East Wisconsin Avenue  
Suite 3300  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108  
414.271.6560